

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FRANCIS AKINRO :  
 :  
 Plaintiff, :  
 v. : CIVIL ACTION NO. L-10-1300  
 :  
 AVIS CAR RENTAL, et al. :  
 :  
 Defendants. :  
 :

**MEMORANDUM**

Plaintiff, a resident of Baltimore, Maryland who holds himself out as a “Professor” and Department of Justice employee, filed this 28 U.S.C. § 1331 action on May 19, 2010, against Avis Rental Car Company. His statement of facts alleges that:

“On May 16, 2010, Avis used Adoko Igbe-lyere, Nigeria, to deny me my right to rent their car claiming I did not have good credit. Mrs. Longworth Iya Lekan together with her tradition medicine of blood of my family blockage me after she combine with the people slaughtering my family and sprinkle of the blood to the road for the blood to killed and hinder me in the United States.”

(Docket No. 1). In his relief request, Plaintiff seeks the award of \$877,000,000,000,000.00, the ability to obtain a rental car from Defendant, and life imprisonment for Defendant’s employees.

(Id.)

Although Plaintiff’s indigency application contains information the court finds questionable, he shall be granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis.<sup>1</sup> This Court may preliminarily review the Complaint allegations before service of process and dismiss them *sua sponte* if satisfied that the Complaint has no factual or legal basis. See Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 324 (1989); see

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff claims that he receives \$3,063.00 in monthly retirement income; has been employed by the U.S. Department of Justice since July of 2009; and has \$200,000.00 accumulated at three separate

also Denton v. Hernandez, 504 U.S. 25, 33 (1992); Cochran v. Morris, 73 F.3d 1310, 1314 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1996); Nasim v. Warden, 64 F.3d 951 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995). As explained by the Supreme Court in Neitzke: "Examples of [factually baseless lawsuits] are claims describing fantastic or delusional scenarios, with which federal district judges are all too familiar." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. at 328.

Even when affording the pro se Complaint and accompanying materials a generous construction, the Court finds no basis to allow the action to go forward or to require supplementation. Plaintiff's Complaint and attachments are replete with fanciful and delusional commentary. The action shall be summarily dismissed under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e). A separate Order follows.

Date: May 25, 2010

/s/

---

Benson Everett Legg  
United States District Judge